DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 367 CG 010 215

AUTHOR Blaesser, Willard W.
TITLE Organization Change Strategies to Facilitate Student Development Models.
PUB DATE 12 Apr 76
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American College Personnel Association, (Chicago, Illinois, April 11-14, 1976); not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; *Change Strategies; Higher Education; Models; *Organizational Development; Speeches; *Student Development; *Student Needs; *Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

This paper defines "student development" as emphasizing processes whereby classroom instructors and student affairs persons in post secondary education collaborate in facilitating the cognitive and affective development of the student. It traces the history of such an approach, and provides some resources in print for those who wish guidelines on how to plan and implement change strategies based on student development philosophy. The paper discusses how to apply principles and practices of Organizational Development (OD), what is known and done by O.D. theorists and practitioners, and how this body of knowledge and expertise can be fruitfully applied to the student development situation. (NG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED131367

Organization Change Strategies to Facilitate Student Development Models

Dr. Willard W. Blaesser, Arizona State University

Pick Congress Hotel - Shelby Room - Monday, 4/12/76

2:15 - 4:45 p.m.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

This topic was proposed about a year ago by several of us on Commission XII of the American College Personnel Association on the assumption that an ACPA Monograph would be published in January, incorporating exemplary student development models, and hence available for our use in preparing this program. Inevitable delays occurred in corralling material and arranging for publication, so the Monograph will not be published until this summer or fall. Drs. Ted Miller and Judy Prince helped us by sending copies of a few of the exemplary models which they had received, and the names of persons who were currently involved in the process of model-building. We invited these persons to attend this session and to contribute freely during the extended discussion period we have planned. We hope they are here. We anticipate diversity and some disagreement. It will both keep us awake and hopefully, somewhat closer to reality. Naturally we would like interaction from as many as possible, not just those who received invitations.

What do we mean by the term "student development," in contrast to the term "student personnel?" From some, student development emphasizes processes whereby classroom instructors and student affairs persons in postsecondary education collaborate in facilitating the cognitive and affective development of the student. Student personnel, an awkward term at best, has been damned as an outworn term which is partially responsible for the dichotomy between the academic and non-academic programs of college and university. However, the American Council on Education brochures in 1937 and 1949 on The Student Personnel Point of View did not propound such a dichotomy. Nor did several writers of that period. In delivering a talk at the University of Wisconsin Centennial Conference in 1948 I proposed the following definition: "Student personnel work consists of all those processes and functions undertaken by an educational institution which place emphasis on: (1) the individual student and his intellectual, social, emotional and physical

CS 010 915

development; (2) the building of curricula, methods of instruction and extra-classroom programs to achieve the preceding objective; (3) democratic procedures in working with students in order to help bring about their greatest possible self-realization; and (4) the performance of student personnel functions rather than emphasis on specially designated individuals to perform them." (1949, p. 373)

Definitions by other persons in recent years have also stressed the interdependence of instructors, counselors, administrators, and other professionals in building varied educational programs for diverse students. Unfortunately, the written word is no substitute for effective action. With a few notable exceptions around the country, student personnel programs cultivated non-academic territory, built separate empires, and became aligned with central administrations of colleges and universities.

In 1968, the American College Personnel Association provided needed leadership and commissioned Phase I of Tomorrow's Higher Education Project, a monograph by Robert D. Brown entitled Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education: A Return to the Academy. (1972)

Phase II, a statement prepared by an ACPA Task Force, entitled A Student Development Model for Student Affairs in Tomorrow's Higher Education, was designed to stimulate the development of new operational models for student affairs professionals. It recognized that student development is the responsibility of the entire college and university community, but intentionally focussed on the role of student affairs. Stressing a proactive approach, the Task Force concluded that the "role of the student affairs staff is to initiate, facilitate, and encourage actions which will unite the community toward the accomplishment of student development goals." (1975, pp. 335-336)

This concept of student development affirms that ... "in post-secondary education cognitive mastery of knowledge should be integrated with the development of persons along such dimensions as cultural awareness, development of a value system, self-awareness, interpersonal skills, and community responsibility.

Self-determination and self-direction can best result when both cognitive and affective development are considered essential to the educational missions of post-secondary institutions." (1975, p. 336) In addition, it is stipulated that students, faculty and staff should be included since all are involved in learning, and in achieving developmental tasks incorporating all phases of development.

The statement called for a competency based approach to help insure optimal student and institutional growth. The competencies include goal setting, assessment, and strategies for student development, the latter being teaching, consultation and milieu management.

It is clear that the major intent of Tomorrow's Higher Education Project is to reconceptualize student affairs work and hopefully to provide a creative input in the shaping of post-secondary education in the years ahead. The authors conclude: "As members of the academic community both learn to understand the stages of development and related developmental tasks through which those in post-secondary institutions are passing and develop expertise in the competencies necessary to implement the student development model, a learning environment which maximizes the integration of the student's cognitive development with the development of the whole personality can be created." (1975, p. 341)

Are there specific guidelines, in print, for those who wish to engage in planned change efforts following student development philosophy and concepts? The 1975 statement which I have been quoting provides some illustrations, but the ACPA Monograph soon to be published will include exemplary models and guidelines which can be adapted to differing conditions in differing institutions. I understand that the Monograph will include the excellent paper which Reuben McDaniel delivered at our ACPA convention in Atlanta last year. Entitled Goal Setting for Student Development, and using an open systems view of goal setting, he analyzed the goal setting process in colleges and universities and the potential involvement of student personnel workers at the levels of purpose, policy, and procedure. His broad-gauge analysis included barriers to institutional change and the strategies for change that could be employed. In strong language he related goal setting for

student development to the overwhelming need to help create a human society. It is an important contribution and I regret it is not in print already.

Now that some background factors have been covered, I want to focus on my main assignment. I want to consider the application of O.D., which is shorthand for organization development, to the initiation and maintenance of student development programs in colleges and universities. I am skating on thin ice. To the best of my knowledge a comprehensive theory of organization development for higher education is non-existent. Nor has O.D. received universal acceptance in theory and practice in other institutions of society. In the words of French and Bell, O.D. is "the name given to the emerging behavioral science that seeks to improve organizations through planned, systematic, long-range efforts focused on the organization's culture and its human and social processes." (1973, xiv)

Another definition also appeals to me, this one from an unknown source. "Organization development is an educational process by which human resources are continuously identified, allocated, and expanded in ways that make these resources more available to the organization and therefore improve the organization's problem solving capabilities. The most general objective of O.D. is to develop self-renewing, self-correcting systems of people who learn to organize themselves in a variety of ways according to the nature of their tasks, and who continue to cope with changing demands the environment makes on the organization."

With some optimism and limited data we might think of a few experimental-type colleges and universities of today that, as organizations, flexibly utilize their human resources and environmental conditions to meet the changing needs of students and society. But we need to remind ourselves that O.D., as an interdisciplinary field, is less than two decades old, that most of its theories, technology and researches stem from the work of social and behavioral scientists with business, industrial and government organizations. Another salutary reminder is that recent writers, though differing somewhat in theory and practice, seem to agree that O.D. is in its adolescent stage. That is good, because it is still sufficiently fluid for colleges and universities to try to shape creatively its theories, practices

and evaluation to their own special needs.

I believe the best documentation of this fluidity is found in a special issue of the Journal of Higher Education devoted entirely to O.D. in higher education. The guest co-editors, Ronald Boyer and Campbell Crockett, freely admit that much more conceptualizing, practice and experience in colleges and universities are needed. Nor do they believe that the current practice of O.D. in business and industry is directly applicable to higher education, which has more diverse goal structures, many more sub-systems, greater difficulty in measuring the quality of their products, and usually minimal task interdependence among groups and between individuals. The organizational pattern is more like a collection of individuals than an integrated team committed to work toward a common set of educational goals (May, 1973).

The six articles in this special issue are (1) Organization Development for Academic Departments, (2) An Internal Change Agent's Role in Restructuring University Governance, (3) Expanding Professional Design Education Through Workshops in the Applied Behavioral Sciences, (4) An O.D. Expert in the Cat Bird's Seat, (5) Developing Change Agent Teams on Campus, and (6) The Higher Education Institute: A Vehicle for Change. Several of the "change agent teams", discussed in article (5) included students, student affairs staff, and members of academic departments.

Perhaps there will be time during our discussion period to comment further about these specific examples of O.D. applications. I recommend this May, 1973 issue of the Journal of Higher Education as a valuable resource for student development leaders who wish to explore possible applications of O.D. approaches to their work.

But before talking further about the possible application of O.D. planned strategies and interventions to post-secondary organizations and student development models, we need to review briefly several problems that complicate matters.

Despite the obvious value of the whole T.H.E. Project, including the Brown Monograph, it should be recognized that the term "student development" does not have a well-established meaning among faculty, staff, administrators, and students.

As Clyde Parker and Weston Morrill have pointed out, such terminology is not precise and is often used conceptually to describe humanism or affective education. They state: "We believe that any change in our profession must be based on solid theories of human development and must be implemented through flexible programming that can overcome the rigidity of bureaucracy." (1974, p. 163) In documenting their point of view Parker and Morrill described nine specific programs which met some developmental needs of students but which were not ideally humanistic.

Another troublesome factor is that some of the rhetoric associated with the term student development makes one wonder if all students are expected to progress through prescribed developmental stages. To what extent will some over-zealous advocates deliberately influence student to move, almost lockstep, through a particular sequence of developmental stages?

It is likely that the new T.H.E. monograph referred to earlier will attempt to clarify the factors just noted. Such clarification is essential if the new terminology is to have solid meaning and maximum utility in higher education. The C.O.S.P.A. (Council of Student Personnel Associations) statement, entitled Student Development Services in Postsecondary Education provides additional concepts to consider in the area of student development (Saddlemire, 1975). Commission XII of the American College Personnel Association has just authorized publication of a new monograph which will be entitled The Nature of Professional Preparation for Student Personnel Work. The monograph will include position statements from six writers in the student personnel and student development field. It is healthy to have different points of view and alternative training models to consider.

But the most troublesome factor to consider when planning change is the nature of a college or university. Someone once said that it is easier to move a cemetery than to achieve a change of any significance in a college or university.

Cohen and March, in one of the research studies of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, have written a provocative book entitled Leadership and Ambiguity. While they focus on the role of the president they also interpret the organizational properties of organized anarchy and describe an organized anarchy as any organi-

zational setting that exhibits three general properties: problematic goals, unclear technology, and fluid participation. In their words, the college or university "... does not know what it is doing. Its goals are either vague or in dispute. Its technology is familiar but not understood. Its major participants wander in and out of the organization. These factors do not make a university a bad organization or a disorganized one, but they do make it a problem to describe, understand and lead." (Cohen and March, 1974, p. 3)

If we accept this interpretation, even partially, it does suggest the difficulties of initiating and maintaining student development programs.

In another research study of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the change processes in ten universities engaging in institutional self-studies were analyzed. He identified the greatest barrier to effective leadership as the complexity of the collegial process of decision making. Since there is dispersion of power and status through the professor-department-college matrix the structure of decision making in most colleges and universities is very flat compared with the typically hierarchical decision making structures in business and government.

As Ladd puts it, "Given the complexity of the typical university decision-making process and the pressures for the status quo, effective leadership in the consideration and implementation stages requires a keen sense of timing and priorities, an ability to keep things moving in an orderly fashion without appearing to force issues, and above all, perhaps, bringing a shared sense of purpose to a disparate and individualistic group." (Ladd, 1973, p. 207)

How will student development leaders of the present and future make progress toward their goals in this unique organization called a college or university?

I teach a graduate course entitled Organization Theory and Change. Considerable emphasis is given to the concept of OD.

As change strategies to implement OD we use in this seminar the taxonomy proposed by Robert Chin and Kenneth Benne (1969) to effect changes in social systems. In the empirical-rational strategy it is assumed that persons are rational and they will follow their rational self-interest once adequate knowledge is given to them.

If it can be explained that the self-interest of the person is congruent with the self-interest of the organization, it is likely that a proposed change will be rationally adopted. Basic research and the dissemination of knowledge to bring about change have strong appeal to academicians in colleges and universities.

In the power-coercive strategy emphasis is upon political and economic sanctions in the exercise of power, and moving toward change goals which those in power have decided are desirable. Legislation and judicial decisions are significant in shaping educational policies. But the processes of re-education of persons usually requires new knowledge, new skills, new attitudes and new value orientations. On the social-interactive level, new conduct may necessitate change in the norms, roles and relationship structures of the colleges, departments, and other units involved. And we are all aware of the typical stance of faculty toward power emanating from "the administration."

When the normative-re-educative strategy is used, the rationality and intelligence of men and women are not denied. However, it is stressed that patterns of action and practice must be supported by sociocultural norms and by commitments of individuals to these norms. The attitude and value systems of individuals undergird such commitments. Change then, will occur only as persons involved alter their normative orientations to old patterns and make commitments to new ones. To do this involves changes in attitudes, values, skills, and significant relationships. This happens at the personal level in terms of internalized meanings, habits and values, and in institutional roles and relationships.

Kurt Lewin's strong contribution to normative-re-educative strategies of changing came from his emphasis on required interrelationships between research, training, and action (1949). This meant for Lewin collaborative relationships between researchers, educators, and activists in the solution of human problems. Two other key beliefs of his were that men and women must participate in their own re-education to bring about change, and that action research was an important strategy which should include participation in groups.

In the normative-re-educative approach much emphasis is placed upon the releasing of creativity in persons, groups, and organizations to meet changing conditions. Personal growth, group problem solving and conflict management are considered essential to release creative responses.

These three change strategies are not mutually exclusive. Elements of all three are found in college and university organizations, as well as in business and government.

Referring back to my seminar in Organization Theory and Change, we use Organization Change or Consultation Teams who offer their services to business and community organizations, including colleges. In the experience of these teams during the past 6 years the barriers to change are by far the highest in the college organization. As a dean of students for many years who professed to be a change agent, and who also consulted with other types of organizations off-campus, I admit that the toughest job of all involved working toward change in the college and university.

With the aid of French and Bell (1973) let me outline briefly the major components of an O.D. approach, utilizing primarily the normative-re-educative strategy of changing. The first step is to diagnose the system and its processes. Data should be collected and analyzed about organization processes such as goal setting, decision making procedures, communications patterns and styles, relationships between interfacing groups, the management of conflict, and planning methods.

The second major step is to intervene in the organization. French and Bell define interventions as "sets of structured activities in which selected organizational units engage with a task or sequence of tasks where the task goals are related directly or indirectly to organizational improvement." (p. 99). Since the intent of OD interventions is to focus on real, live problems it is essential to have or to develop the skills and knowledge to solve them. This may require special workshops and teaching modules for organization task teams.

The third step is to maintain and manage the O.D. process. This involves applying the action research principles of goal setting, coupled with data feedback, to guide and evaluate the effectiveness of actions. Questions are raised such as: Are the interventions timely and relevant? Are the activities producing the effects intended and wanted? If not, why not? If so, why? Continued careful management of the OD process will determine success or failure of the improvement effort.

I want to stress that the diagnostic activities referred to in the first step are crucial. In planning a change in the status quo of an organization or a program there should be a systematic diagnosis of the existing situation using data collection methods of interviews, questionnaires, surveys, and meetings of key persons. These data should make possible an analysis of the possibilities and limitations for change, and if the decision is made to proceed, an action plan for initiating and maintaining the change is developed. Administrators, in planning for changes or new programs frequently tend to move quickly from a superficial diagnosis to the action steps. A more thorough diagnosis of all aspects of the situation, including the relationships of key persons to the planned change, will produce a more effective result. In OD terminology, the "feeding back" of such data to the leadership group concerned is an active process requiring in-depth attention.

Let us assume that the hypothetical College or University of Shelby does not have information about the values, attitudes and other characteristics of its students. The diagnostic activities initiated by the student development leadership group show that such information is desired and would be utilized by a number of key faculty and administrators. They are not in the majority but they constitute an important minority. They want to improve teaching, academic advising, counseling, and other elements of the educational program of Shelby. They are concerned about how this type of research will be funded but are willing to have the possibilities explored.

One likely intervention step at this stage is to arrange for the appointment of a Task Force, selected jointly by the academic vice president and the student affairs vice president from a panel of names submitted by the student development leadership group. The Task Force may need to begin with some team building for itself before plunging into the work of further analysis and the preparation of recommendations. It is usually essential to have goal setting, role clarification, improvement of communications, the building of effective interpersonal relationships, the identification of hidden agendas, the testing of supervision-subordinate and peer relationships, the surfacing of conflicts, the building of skills in understanding and managing group processes, and the determination of resources within and outside the Task Force. Often an external consultant can be useful to the Task Force in its team building and in the continuation of its work. A skilled consultant may be available in the College or University of Shelby, a behavioral scientist with consulting experience who is a faculty member in Liberal Arts, Business or Education. He or she should be a neutral facilitator without personal involvement in the decision making process.

If this type of consultant is not available within the institution it may be possible to exchange consulting or other types of services with another college or university in the region. Inter-institutional cooperation is increasing and the exchange of consultants can be inexpensive and mutually beneficial.

Continuing with our illustration, let us assume the Task Force expands its initial objective of exploring various methods of securing data on student characteristics and decides to recommend the establishment of a Center of Institutional Studies and Development. This is done in the belief that (1) collection of data on student characteristics should not be just a one-time effort and that related milieu factors are also important, (2) data on faculty, administrators and staff characteristics should also be secured, (3) data on organizational variables such as inter-dependent, and inter-school and central administration relationships are needed, and (4) the Center should evolve into a continuing action-research and coordinating unit of the College or University of Shelby to help bring about

institutional self-renewal programs.

The Task Force recommends the appointment of a Policy Committee for the Center of Institutional Studies and Development, representing the academic, student affairs, the major administrative components of the institution and student leaders. It is strongly suggested that the Policy Committee begin its work with team building sessions similar to those experienced by the Task Force. Here, too, a skilled consultant would be helpful as a neutral facilitator without involvement in the determination of policies.

Another key recommendation of the Task Force concerns the initial staffing of the Center. As a modest beginning it is proposed to have only one or two full-time professional staff plus several academic and student affairs persons who agree to try out split appointments which provide for one-quarter to one-half time in the Center. If qualified graduate students are available, several internships could be instituted in cooperation with relevant academic departments.

The Task Force does not solve the problem of funding the Center, but recommends exploration of financial help beyond the regular budget of the institution, federal and state grants, and foundation grants. Alumni Association fund raising, class gift funds and grants from student government are examples of resources usually not tapped for action research projects.

Some colleges and universities already have Offices of Institutional Research or units with similar titles. Most of them are appendages of the central administration and carry out studies dealing with budgets, enrollment projections, space utilization distribution of grades, etc. However, our hypothetical Task Force in such an institution could focus on expanding the concept and programming of an established Office of Institutional Research in order to include the developmental type of research we have been talking about. The obstacles to accomplishing this are considerable and will require careful handling of the usual resistances to change.

Earlier in my series of assumptions I stated that the student development leadership group, in its diagnostic OD activities, had determined that data on student characteristics, if available, would be utilized. The very large problem

remains of deciding which data-based innovation project or projects should be tried. If OD change strategies are to be applied the basic components of diagnosis, action or intervention, and process maintenance should be carried out. The normative-re-educative approach would be emphasized in whatever innovative program is started.

OD change strategies have by no means cornered the market on how to innovate or alter existing programs in colleges and universities. There has been far too little systematic experimentation regarding change efforts of any type. Even in the rapidly growing body of OD knowledge and experience in business, industry and government during the past ten years there is considerable variation in approaches and in the results achieved. In most of these efforts careful assessment of methodology and outcomes have been lacking. Useful technology is available, but both organizational variables and human variables greatly complicate the task of evaluation. And when we recall the Cohen and March description of a college or university organization as an "organized anarchy" we can better understand the paucity of information in the literature about OD change strategies in post-secondary education.

Although this situation is deplored, we must commend those persons who are writing about change efforts, whether or not undergirded by a widely agreed upon systematic body of organization theory. It is particularly helpful when those who write about change include information about both successes and failures. For example, in a forthright article, Hurst, Weigel, Morrill and Richardson (1973) described the creation and the dismantling of an Office of Student Development at one university in which a complicated mix of organizational and personal variables raised barriers to change that could not be overcome.

Sikes, Schlesinger and Seashore, in their book entitled Renewing Higher Education from Within (1974) frankly discussed their work with change teams at eight institutions between 1970 and 1974. This was an NTL Institute project activated by a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. Each team selected its own specialized goals although there was a commonality of interest in improving the campus climate for teaching and learning, in developing effective

decision making processes which included the involvement of students, and in upgrading the quality of services received by students.

These action-research teams in the colleges had varying degrees of success as they developed projects ranging from altering curricula to establishing a peer counseling service. Members of the teams were student, faculty and student affairs leaders who volunteered to engage in the change efforts. The conceptual model incorporates action-research activities by the campus teams aided by outside consultants provided by NTL. The authors provide a helpful analysis of the whole process, including its shortcomings. They concluded that the effectiveness of change agent teams had been demonstrated, even though the technology of change teams in colleges and universities remains very rudimentary. The second part of the book is a manual of guidelines which outline pitfalls and the ingredients of success.

Victor Baldridge's book (1971) entitled Power and Conflict in the University utilized the case study of a large private university to build a new political interpretation of university governance. In developing the political model he applied the sociological use of conflict theory, the community power theorists in political science and the "informal groups" approach in organization theory.

As an example of the emphasis in his research he applied conflict theory to the university setting by examining change rather than stability, divergent values instead of common values, the dynamics of conflict instead of concensus, and the role of interest groups in creating dissonance instead of focusing on the integration of the whole university (p. 16).

In his words, "The sociologist wants to know how the social structure of the university influences the decision processes, how political pressures are brought on decision makers, how decisions are forged out of the conflict, and how the policies, once set, are implemented. Thus our political model points to five points of analysis: social structure features, interest articulation processes, legislative phases, policy outcomes, and policy executions." (p. 23). Baldridge's broad political analysis of university governance may seem far removed from

student development models involving teaching, consultation, and milieu management. Whether or not we agree with most of his conclusions as he applies his model to changes ranging from educational philosophy, a student revolt or to a departmental reorganization, we who are student development practitioners and/or professors should be fully cognizant of political analyses represented by his study.

A 1975 book by Victor Baldridge and Terrence Deal, entitled Managing Change in Educational Organizations includes a variety of contributions by organizational change authorities such as Daniel Katz, Robert Kahn, Burton Clark, Matthew Miles, Richard Schumck, Philip Runkel, Ronald Lippitt, Warren Bennis, Mark Chesler and others. Some of the materials apply directly to colleges and universities. Baldridge and Deal also contribute their own sociological analyses. Quite apart from their sociological emphases they rightly remind us that to date most change development and management in colleges and universities are based to a large extent on intuition and seat-of-the-pants strategy. We lack valid, tested scientific principles and processes of change. Most of us, I believe, would also agree that one over-riding goal of change proponents is to help build flexible colleges and universities responsive to environments and to problem-solving research, innovations and action alternatives.

We student development practitioners and/or professors (I include administrators as practitioners) would benefit also by careful study of another book published recently - Managing Academic Change, by S.V. Martorana and Eileen Kuhns (1975). It is a practical book with case descriptions of academic innovations and the means by which they were implemented. It is designed for decision makers, faculty members, trustees, other officials - and for "the scholars and analysts of institutional change - sociologists, economists, political scientists, and professors of higher education ...." (xv). No mention is made of student development and student affairs leaders, psychologists, student life researchers, mental health practitioners, student development teachers, consultants or milieu managers. Why not? Perhaps we can speculate about this during our discussion period.

The authors propose an "interactive forces theory" in classifying forces for change in colleges and universities as personal, extrapersonal, or goal hiatus forces. Time does not permit an exposition of this theory except to comment that it has some similarities to OD change theory. I should, however, note briefly the change strategies and logistics they recommend for consideration. Fortunately they agree that all have some positive and negative features dependent on utilization and the organizational context involved.

Here is a sampling of their strategies and tactics for implementation (pp. 164-172):

Low-profile action: Deemphasize the importance of the innovation and relate it to traditional procedures. Persuade doubters that the change is an effort to return the institution to its true goals, its traditional purposes.

Systematic experimentation: To avoid random innovation there should be a radical departure - i.e., some control-group and experimental-group research to plan and evaluate change.

Participant involvement versus power coercion: Manipulating organizational conditions such as rewards is discouraged. If there is participant involvement the adoption of the innovation is more likely.

Development of legitimacy: Examples given concerned the external-degree innovations in New York State and the endorsement of the prestigious Carnegie Corporation.

Creation of power blocks: This is an old strategy in which attempts are made to gain support from leaders in the educational community, and at times, the outside community when certain interests converge. An example given was the community health-care program at Johns Hopkins.

Control of communication: Favorable progress reports on the innovation are helpful, but information can be distorted if those in control insist on withholding information that may be negative.

Like strategies, the authors note that tactics have both positive and negative elements. Hence for ethical reasons some are less desirable in trying

to effect change. I will simply list some of their tactics for implementation with little or no explanation.

Appreciation of timing of the change or innovation.

Obtaining an overview. A breadth of view is necessary to understand the interlocking problems of the total institution.

Determining obstacles most likely to interfere with the change.

Providing reassurance. If change proponents clearly communicate their ideas and activities unnecessary opposition may be avoided.

Building on existing concerns. If such relationships are clarified additional support can be gained.

Avoiding rejection. Sometimes proposing a pilot program with built-in evaluation will reduce opposition.

Respecting the past. If there are deeply intrenched academic and social values, proponents of change should show respect and understanding of the accomplishments of the past.

Persuading the opposition. The tactic of forthright persuasion may permit enough of the opposition to allow a trial of the change.

Confronting the opposition. This may be helpful at some stages of proposing a change, if emotional involvements can be accepted and relevant facts placed on the table for rational consideration.

Compromise and co-opting. Sometimes opposing groups can find commonalities and support change in the organization which is gradual and non-violent.

Selecting personnel for decision-making positions. If respected leaders are placed on decision-making groups the proposed change stands a better chance of being adopted and implemented. But any blatant stacking of the deck will arouse high opposition.

Martorona and Kuhns remind us that strategies for innovation must permit room for maneuvering, and that tactics to carry out the strategies are trial and error phenomena and hence are expendable. I would add that strategies must also remain flexible and that change agents must be alert to new developments in the organi-

zation and its sub-systems.

In closing, let me stress that my bias toward the utilization of OD change strategies by student development leaders is not deeply ingrained. With organization theory and its application to systematic innovation in colleges and universities still lacking a widely supported conceptual framework we must have continuing experimentation with theories and practices. My main concern is that student development leaders keep in perspective the total organization of the college or university and its many sub-systems. Teaching, consulting and milieu management strategies are commendable if they lead to the improved learning and education of the student, to concern for his/her development to full potential, and to wide organizational support for comprehensive educational services for students.

I sense at times that some proponents of student development models are losing interest in services to students that are not closely aligned with the academic life of the institution. As one who has always advocated and worked toward integration of the academic with other educational services to students. I may be overly-sensitive to implications that the long-term goal of full integration of the institution's educational programs and services is losing adherents. I hope I am wrong, and that student development leaders will plan and carry out innovative programs which take into account all resources essential for individual growth and organization renewal.

Despite the lack of a widely supported conceptual framework for organization development in higher education, student development leaders now have access to a rapidly growing body of knowledge and practice in organizational dynamics and personal dynamics. In addition to resources already mentioned I want to ballyhoo a book that came off the press several weeks ago. It is the third revision of The Planning of Change by Bennis, Benne, Chin, and Corey, published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston (1976). About four-fifths of the third revision is new material, reflecting new theory-building, research, and experimentation in applied social and behavioral science.

The book says little about college and university organizations. But it is rich in potential application to higher education. Planned change is a complex method which deliberately and experimentally employs knowledge to help improve the interdependency of organizational and human development. The goal is to improve the operations of a human system, whether it be a self-system, social system, or a cultural system, through the utilization of valid knowledge (p. 2).

Student development leaders are stimulating and carrying out important program innovations in various sectors of higher education. I believe their work will have greater and more lasting impact if they adapt the substantial knowledge already available concerning organizational dynamics to the planning of change, even in the "organized anarchies" of colleges and universities.

References

BALDRIDGE, V. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

BALDRIDGE, V. and DEAL, T. Managing Change in Educational Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

BENNIS, W., BENNE, K., CHIN, R., and COREY, K. The Planning of Change. Third edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

BLAESSER, Willard W., and HOPKINS, Everett H. The future of student personnel work in higher education. IN FOULKES, J.G. (ed.), Higher Education for American Society. New York: George Banta Publishing Company, 1949.

BROWN, Robert D. Student development in tomorrow's higher education: A return to the academy. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1972. (Monograph)

BOYER, R. and CROCKETT, C. Guest co-editors. Journal of Higher Education, 1973, XLIV, 5, May.

CHIN, R. and BENNE, K. General strategies for effecting changes in human systems. IN BENNIS, W., BENNE, K., and CHIN, R. The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

COHEN, M. and MARCH, J. Leadership and Ambiguity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

FRENCH, W. and BELL, C. Organization Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973.

LADD, D. Change in Educational Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

LEWIN, K. Cassirer's philosophy of science and social science. IN Schlipp, P. (ed.), The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer. New York: Tudor, 1949.

MARTORANA, S. and KUHNS, E. Managing Academic Change. San Francisco: Joseey-Bass, 1975.

MILLER, T.K., et al. A student development model for student affairs in tomorrow's higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 16, 4, 334-341.

PARKER, C. and MORRILL, W. Student development alternatives. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1974, 15, 3, 163-167.

SADDLEMIRE, G. Student development services in post-secondary education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 16, 6, 524-528.

SIKES, W., SCHLESINGER, L., and SEASHORE, C. Renewing Higher Education from Within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.